UNION OR DISUNION.

The Union Cannot and Shall Not be Disselved.

MR. LINCOLN NOT AN ABOLITIONIST.

SPEECH OF THE HON. JOHN M. BOTTS.

AT HOLCOMBE HALL,

In Lynchburg, Va., on Thursday Evenist, O.

On Thursday evening Holcombe Hall was crowded to hear the address of Mr. Botts. His appearance on the platform was the signal for the wildest enthusiasm, which continued for several minutes. When quiet was meetered, John M. Speed, eeq., introduced the distinguished gentleman to his audience in a brief speech, at be conclusion of which Mr. Botts came forward and addressed them as follows:

FELLOW-CITIZENS: This being the first time I have had an opportunity of presenting myself to the people of Lynchburg, it becomes me to return my acknowledgments for the greeting I have received: although I must confess I know not the party to which I am indebted for this flattering reception, for I stand here in rather a new character-that of a representative of the Democratic party. [Laughter.] If I do not play my partwell, it is not for the want of good will toward tha party, for, as you well know, the kindred and mos amiable relations have always subsisted between us. [Renewed laughter.] Yet I do not know whether [Renewed laughter.] Yet I do not know whether I shall come up to the expectations of some of my Democratic friends, for a paper has been put into my hands by which I ascertain, with some surprise, that it is expected I will make at least one thousand votes for the Democratic party. [Langhter.] But I trust they will be content, when I have done, and in a spirit of charity to compromise for half that number. [Great hughter.] But, in all seriousness, for I have little time for preliminary remarks, I trust I shall be able to gain your attention, and that you will be patient while I deliver to you my views on all the issues involved in the present Presidential campaign.

the present Presidential campaign.

Fellow-citizens, I am not here in the character that I have often occupied before in my younger days; I am not here as a partisan. I have passed the period of life when it becomes me, in my judgment, to play that part, and no small share of experience in political life beaches me that I have a country to serve and to save if I can, which rises very far above all party considera-tions; and I hesitate not to say that if this were a mere party centest, for the defeat of this party or for the tri-mann of that, I should leave it to younger and more active men. But when I saw dismion and treason, with a brazen front, and with a bold and deliant tongue, stanking through this glorious old Commonwealth of Virginia, I felt I had no right to devote myself to re-Virginia, I feit I had no right to devote myself to remineneat—that my country was entitled to what influence I might be able to exart; and, casing all other
enniderations uside, I took the field with a determination to circharge my share of daty. [Applanes.] In
the remarks I propose to submit, I beg leave to eap
that I do not address myself to the young, the thoughtless, the inconsiderate, and the unreflecting. I propose
te address myself to the calm reflections of intelligent
men—men who are capable of appreciating the argament which I shall offer, and who value the instautions of the country. I know very well, gentlemen,
that what I shall say will not be approved by all I
know I shall be, as I have been heretofore, grossly
misrepresented, villified, and denounced. I know I
main be called an Abobnounst.
A Voice—Of course.

A Voice—Of course.

Of course—and why not? Because I do not vote the Democratic ticket. And yet, when I reflect that such men as Heary Clay, Wittiam Henry Herrison, Zachary Taylor, and Winfield Scott, all natives of this proud old Commenwealth, have been held, by that party The price of the state of the provided of the property of the provided of the which denounces me, as unsound on the institution of Blavery—as being, in truth, Abolitionists of the dark-est dye, and that such men as Martin Van Buren, Gen. heard of a division in the Democratic party as long as there remained any money in the treasury that they could appropriate to themselves; but having spent \$17,000,000 that were in the Treasury at the time they came into power, and created a debt of \$00,000,000 more, it might be that they had divided for the purpose of emabling us to get into power that we might replenish it for them. [Laughter and applause.] But I think there is another reason for it, which I shall attempt to make manifest. When you get into conversation with some of those gentlemen who talk in this way of the contingency to which I refer, you will find they have almost as many reasons as there are persons you encounter and make inquiry of. If you ask one of the Breckinridge portion of the Democracy why they have two candidates in the field, and why they could not support Dougha, who was the regular nominee of the National Democratic party, if such a party can be supposed to exist, they tell you it was because Donglas was the advocate of the doctrine of Squatter Severeignty, and that he stands on a platform they Douglas was the advocate of the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty, and that he stands on a platform they cannot support, notwithstanding the fact that in the Charleston Convention they voted fifty-seven times for Mr. Hunter—I mean the delegation from Virginia—upon the identical platform that Douglas now occupies. But I take issue with the gentlemen, and I deny that Squatter Sovereignty has anything to do with the question between the Breckinnidge and Douglas men. I deny it because I make the assertion, broadly and without qualification, that there was not a Democrat from the Southern States in the Charleston Convention that did not stand unqualifiedly and overwhelm tion that did not stand unqualifiedly and overwhelm inch that did not stand unquantedly and overwhelmingly committed to Squatter Sovereignty. They were all its advocates, and they all assisted as far as they could, whether in Congress or out of it, in establishing that doctrine. What is the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty? It is non-intervention. What is non-intervention? It is non-interference. Non-interference the part of whom? Non-interference non-intervention? It is non-interference. Non-in-terference on the part of whom? Non-interference on the part of Congress. On the part of Congress with whom? With the people of the Territories. And during the discussion of the Kansas-Nebraska bill, this great fundamental feature of the bill was specially recommended by our Democratic representatives from the South to their constituents on that especial ground, and no other. It would be no very difficult task to

First of all, take Mr. Cass, the present Democratic

take up The Congressional Globe and show that there was not a Southern representative who advocated

that bill, that did not put it upon the ground of non-in-tervention, as being the feature of the bill which most recommended it to the country. I shall not undertake to do this, but I propose to submit authority that will be as conclusive on the subject as if I were to read every speech of those who addressed Congress on the

First of all, take Mr. Cass, the present Democratic Secretary of State, and we find that a day or two after the passage of the bill, he said:

"On the morning of the passage of the bill, I congratulate the Senate on the triumph of Squatter Soverelanty, and I have just cause for congratulation. Many of us have labored long and mealously for the recognition of political freedom, and had been exposed to mirrepresentation and demundation. When, therefore a bill had received the sanction of the Senate, which conferred a greater freedom on the Territories than had ever before been graited to such local communities, yielding up all the supervisory authority by Congress over their legislation. It left that a rreat advance had been made in the progress of free principles."

There, then, was the congratulation of one of the foremost men of the party, and one of the ablest ex-pounders of law and the Constitution in the Senate of the United States. Did any member of the Democratie party from the South rise in his place and dispute this authority of Gen. Case, that the doctrine of Squatthis authority of Gen. Case, that the doctries of Squatter Sovereignty was established by the passage of the subject was our own representative, Mr. Mason, and what does he say? This gentleman, who now advocates the election of Breckinridge, and opposes the election of Douglas upon the ground that he cannot gustain the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty, said to

the Senate:

"From the experience which the Southern States have had of the tendencies of Congress heretofers on the subject of Slavery. I do not know that we may not quite as safely trust the people, come from where they may, as the Congress of the United States, with that institution.

Hot, this is not all.

But this is not all. In the year 1850, on the occasion of the anniversary of Mr. Clay's birthday, the 12th day of April, at a place called Ashland, formerly called Shah Cottage—which you have all seen on your way to the North—a short distance from Hichmond; a large

tumber of distinguished gentlemen were invited to participate in the celebration of that day. Among others was the then Attorney-General of the United States, the Hon. Caleb Cushing, late presiding officer of the Charleston Convention, and subsequently presiding efficer of the Secoding Convention at Baltimore, and who now expresses a boly horror at this doctrine of Squatter Soversignty. Mr. Cushing came to Ashland as the law officer of the Government, the highest legal officer in the United States, and he came for the proposen of giving a legal, technical construction to the bill, for that constituted the main features of his remarks. As you will perceive, he was anxious to keep good company by associating the name of Henry Clay with the doctrine of Squatter Soversignty, which high honor I took occasion to disclaim for Mr. Clay in the papers of next day; and before I read what he said, you will pardon me for saying that he often uses words that even educated men know not the meaning of. He has number of distinguished gentlemen were invited to pareven educated men know not the meaning of. He has been a professor of languages, and is fond of indulging in grandiloquent, or what is commonly termed high-falutin words. And you will pardon me if I undertake to explain what he means, as I so along.

Take to explain what he means, as I ro along.

"I satisficate that many eloquent and stirring things will be said by gentlemen precent, in exhibition of the character, of the career, and of the lame of Henry Clay. I will venture to stand upon a single point in that great, orbillant, and glorious career. I will rear to that finel struggle, of the patrione elio to of Henry Clay—that final struggle in the Senate of the fulled State, when he copperated with others of his composers, and am ug them gentlemen here present, in those efforts which resulted in the establishment, I will see ture to say, in the perpetual and unshakulle establishment is the public law and political theory of the United States, of his absolute, and the safety of the absolute, and the safety of the absolute, and the safety of the absolute and the safety of the safety of the safety. tiemen here present, to those efforts which result d in the establishment. I will see ture to say, to the perpetual and unshatable establishment is the public law and political theory of the United States, of the absolute equality, the seepast political attonomy (any other man would have said the right of self-averament for that is what autonomy means) "of each and aid these States; the great covol ary of time dottrine is the establishment of the corresponding theory that each distinct inchoate State (anybody class would have said earth distinct Territory) "of this Union anall determine for itself what shall be handed to this Union anall determine for itself what shall be handed in the establishment of that principle which has new become fixed and irrevocable in spite of an the howles of faction. In all parts of this Union it must become the unushingue corviction of the people of three United States that whether a State in this Union is or is not to regulate labor, in this of that man, depends upon the will of the recycle of the State on Transfrour."

"Of that State or Territory." So that we have the authority of the law officer of the Government as to what was meant by the bill; that it has become a fixed and irrevocable law of the land in spite of all the howle of faction, that the Territories shall determine for themselves whether or no Slavery shall be admitted within their borders.

ted within their borders.

If that is not enough, let me proceed a little further, If that is not enough, let we proceed a internation, and give you the testimony of two other important gentlemen; and, I will here remark that it seems to have been a most miraculous accident that these gentleman should have fallen, in their hot haste to condomn

have been a most miraculous accident that these gentleman should have fallen, in their hot hasts to condomn and denounce all who advocate the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty—it was truly miraculous that they should have isllen on two gentlemen who occupied precisely and identically the same position that Louglas occupies on the question. I dare say many of you have seen this before, but it is necessary, for the argument, that I shall present it for your consideration again, Mr. Breekinridge says:

"Ameng many misrepresentations sent to the country by some of the enemies of this bill, perhaps none is more fisgrant thun the charge that it proposes to legislate Slavery into Kansas and Nebraska. Sir, it the bill contained such a feature twould not receive my vote. The right to establish involves the correlative right to probabit; and, denying both. I would vote for neither.

"The effect of the repeal (of the Missouri Compromise), therefore, is neither to establish nor to exclude Slavery, but to leave the future condition of the Territories dependent wholly upon the action of the inhabitants, subject only to such limitations as the Federal Constitution may impose.

It will be observed that the right of the people to regulate, in their own way, all their domestic institutions, is left wholly untouched, except that whatever is done—must be done in accordance with the Constitution—the supreme law for us all."

In 1856 he said:

"The recent legislation of Congress (on the Kansas-Nebraska bill) respecting domestic Slavery, derived as it has been from the original and pure formation of legitimate political power, the will of the majority, promises ere long to allay the dangerous excitement. This legislation is founded on principle as ancient as free government itself, and in accordance with them has simply deciared data the people of Territory. Bise those of a State, shall decide for themselves whether Slavery shall or shall not exist within their imits.

Again, he said in 1856, after his election to the Vice-

Again, he said in 1830, after his election of the vice-presidency:

"The whole power of the Democratic organization is pledged to the following propositions: That Congress shall not intervene on this subject for Saverry in the Stater, in the Territories, or in the District of Colombia, that the people of each Territory shall determine the question for themselves, and he admitted into the I rion upon a feeting of perfect equality with the original States without distribution, on account of the allowange or probibition of Slavery."

Does Douglas say more or less upon the subject? Is it not precisely and identically his ground. And so

stitution and assist for it? Not a word. But it is not intended now to legislate Slavery into or out of the Territories, but to leave the people thereof (now) free to legislate in their own way; and I will tay, as Douglas said at Norfolk that if any man in Congress did not understand the language of the bill, he ought to confess his incapatity to represent the public, and resign his seat and come home. [Applause.] I will add, he ought to go to school and learn the English

language sgain.

They were not deceived. They outwisted them-selves. They came home, and attempted to raise their emigrant aid societies throughout the South. Alabama and South Carolina, both I believe, made appropriations out of the public treasury to all who would go into the Territories to sustain Slavery, and in the town of Petersburg, my own city, in this State, they did the game thing, raised private subscriptions to pay the expenses of the emigrants, but they did not succeed in getting enough of them to accomplish their purpose, and they were beaten at their own game.

How stands it now in regard to New-Mexico? It has authorized the introduction of Slavery. Do you hear anything from Breckinridge or the Democratic party scanies Souther Soversenty there? Not a emigrant aid societies throughout the South. Alabama

party against Squatter Sovereignty there? Not a word. That is all right. They legislated there in accordance with their views; but when they legislate elsewhere in opposition to their views, they oppose it. Why, gentlemen, there is but one thing that can furnish Why, gentiemen, there is but one thing that can furnish a fit illustration of the conduct of these men, and that is the case of a desperate gambler who bets his all upon the throwing of the die, or the turning of a card, or upon a game of all-fours; the parties stand six to six; the adversary thrus up Jack, and the party who proposed the game and the wager grabs the stakes and attempts to run off, but is caught and held by the conttail, as these gentlemen are. It is a miserable subtertait, as these gentlementare. It is a miserable subser-force, unworthy of the men who resort to it, to say they did not intend to give the power of legislation to the Territories. And when I raised my voice against it in 1851, during the pendancy of that bill, and asked you to pause and reflect before you gave that measure your approval, I was universally denounced and condemned, not only by the Democratic party and press, but by my own party, as the only traiter to the South. Now we are all traiters and Abolittonists in one pen

Now we are all trainers and Acondomate in one pen together. (Laughter and applicate.)

Well, you will ask somebody else what they pro-pose the dissolution of the Union for, and he will give you another reason. One says he is not willing to remain in the Union except on the condition of entire equality among the States. Who has proposed inequality among the States? Do not the small States of Rhode Island and Delaware exercise

all their constitutional powers in the Government to the full extent that the great States of New-York and ennsylvania can do?
But they say unless the people of the South are permitted to carry their slaves into the Territories there is no equality among the States. The answer to which that if that constitutes inequality, then equality er did exist, and was never intended to exist, for never did enter, and was never incended to exist, for the very men who made the Constitution, themselves excluded you from all right to carry slaves into any part of the territory then delonging to and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. Such is the tyranny of the public press and of public

Such is the tyrainty of the paties press and of putter opinion, that few men date say what they think on this vexed and interminable subject of Slavery, which they did by the ordinance of 1767—which was adopted instructor the Constitution was ratifed—and which was immediately on the assembling of the first Congress thus recognized by a presentic to a law passed on the 7th of August, 1769, which presentle is in the following wing words; in order that the ordinance of the United States, Whereas, in order that the ordinance of the territory norther

inequality in the Union. This, then, is not the real reason or ground of complaint.

I am fally aware, gentlemen, that the tyrauny of the

I am fally aware, gentlemen, that the tyranny of the public press, and I may say, to some extent of public cpinion is such that few men can dare to pross the opinions they really entertain in this much vexed and annoying question of Slavery. I can dare to do it, and will do it—because it is a free country. I am a free man and have no favors to ask of any one. [Great applause.] Let any man express a sound rational and plause.] national, sensible and conservative opinion on the subject of Slavery, and he is instantly stigmatized and denonneed as an Abolitionist, and a traitor to the South, unless, indeed, he belongs to the Democratic party; then he is at liberty to say and think what he chooses, No such ridiculous and contemptible imputations shall deter me from saying what I think, and thinking what

I am free to say that the events of the last Winter

I please.

I am free to say that the events of the last Winter and Spring, in my own State, have smothered, if they have not extinguished, whatever aspirations I might have indulged, and I have no desire that my name shall ever again be coupled with any political office—no man is more indifferent to political honors than I am—and so I proceed. [Applanse.]

Well, you ask another portion of the party why they would dissolve the Union, and they tell you it is owing to the John Brown raid. The Cotton States propose to take our grievances off our hands, thinking, I suppose, we cannot take care of ourselves or have not sufficiently put lated the sggressions, or that it did not cost quite money enough, to do so, and they generally propose to take it upon themselves to redress our wrongs. Thankful for small favors, we can take care of all such, without the aid of Mesers. Yancey and Compeny. [Laughter.]

Well, you put the same question to another, and he tolls you it is because the Fugitive Slave law has been multified in fourteen States. Well, if that is so, it is all wrong and ought to be corrected. But it happens not to be true. There are but three States, so far as I am informed, that have passed the Personal Liberty bill—Mi. higan, Vermont, and Massachusetts. Michigan is too remote for a layer to get to, and as far as che is

Mi higan, Vermont, and Massachusetts. Michigan is too remote for a slave to get to, and as far as she is cooked ned, it is practically of no moment. Theoreti-Minight, virtuous, and master as a far as che is concerned, it is practically of no moment. Theoretically, it is all wrong, and ought to be corrected. Vermont lies on the borders of Canada. There is no difficulty in running a slave into the Canadian provinces, and Marrachuestis has modified her Personal Liberty bill, but I am not prepared to say to what extent. But if any State in the Union has nollified or resisted it, I say it is all wrong. But what right have these extreme Southern States to complain and threaten to break up the Government. First they lose no slaves; it is from the border States the slaves run off. We are the sufferers, not they; and if we are willing to live in the Union, we beg them not to go out on our account; we will try and take care of ourselves. Secondly, if those States have nullified the law, who set the example? Was it not set by the Cotton States, who have insisted on the right of each State to judge for itself. Thirdly, because the responsibility rests at last not upon on the right of each State to judge for itself. Thirdly, because the responsibility rests at last not upon those States that have nullified the law, but on the Democratic President of the United States. Who is responsible for the resistance that may be made to the law, or for any nullification of the Fugitive Slave or any other law, whether in Massachusetts or in South Carolina? It is the man who has laid his hand upon the sacred book and sworn to see the laws faithfully executed. It is the President of the United States—it is James Buchanan who is responsible for it—and if you James Buchanan who is responsible for it—and if you had a man there who knew his duty, and possessed the

James Buchanan who is responsible for it—and it you had a man there who knew his duty, and possessed the courage to perform it, you would hear nothing of nullification in any State. They would all be made to execute the law, cost what it might—even if it cost every dollar in the Treasury, and the life of every man in the Army and Navy of the United States—it is his business to see the laws faithfully executed in every State; and when Mr. Fillmore was there he did execute the law. [Applause] He sent Federal troops to Boston to execute the law, as it was his duty to do.

Now let me say a word about this Fugitive Slave law, and explain what are the objections made to its execution in the North. Two features of it are much complained of. First of all, they complain of a feature of that bill which authorizes the Marshal of the District to call on any person in the hearing of his voice to aid him in capturing a fugitive slave. They say, and I think, with propriety, that inasmuch as you are not required to do it here, you have no right to require them to do it there. If a man's slave runs away, you have no right to call upon me to aid in the extehring of the slave; but if the Marshal has taken possession of the slave; and there is an attempt to rescue the sion of the slave, and there is an attempt to rescue the slave, then he has the right to call on all men to vindi-

account of the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty, nor of the inequality of the States, n.r. of the Fagilive Slave law, that the B eckinridge Democracy propose a dia-solution of the Union in a certain contangency. Well, law, that the B eckinnidge Democracy propose a dis-solution of the Union in a certain contingency. Well, another will say it is because you will not give us a Territorial bid for the protection of Savery. I take issue again, and I say that is not the reason. Why is that not the reason? First, because when Mr. Brown of M ssissippi, at the last sees ion of Congress, proposed an am noment to a bid, giving a Territorial Code, it received but three voices in the Senate. They did not went it. It did not suit their conveniences to have it. It would have removed one of the weapons with which It would have removed one of the weapons with which they proposed to fire the Southern heart and precipitate the Cotton States into a revolution. They would not

the Cotton States into a revolution. They would not vote for it. There was no necessity for it, and more than that they were not entitled to it.

But that constitutes no reason for their present position of hostility to the Government. I say they do not want it. First, because there is no teachy for which they could send their slaves; and, secondly, if all the territories were at their control, they have no negroes to send. The States which propose a dissolution of the Union because they cannot send their slaves into ter-Union because they cannot send their slaves into territories that do not exist, are now clamoring for a revival of the slave trade in order to supply that deficiency. Thirdly, if they had the territory, and the negroes to send, they have not the white men to send with them. Have we in the South any population to spare? If we dispose of any portion of our white population by sending them into the Territories, where we have no negroes, as a matter of course we depreciate the value of our lands, lessen our importance in the national councils, and become reduced to the political con-dition of one of the smallest States in the Union. What dition of one of the smallest States in the Union. What do you want to dissolve the Union for? Do they want protection to their slave property? First, who disturbs them in the possession of their slaves? Sec-endly, what right have they to ask for protection to their slaves? Have not the Cotion States all ways re-sisted this principle of protection, and threatened to dissolve the Union if the principle of protection should be recognized by Congress; and when the Whig party claimed protection for the noor man's labor, which discove the Chion if the principle of protestion adding be recognized by Congress; and when the Whig party claimed protection for the poor man's labor, which constituted the property and wealth of the country, they were always met by threats to discove the Union, to destroy the Government, if such protection was af-

Now they come forward and say, if you do not pro tect the rich man's negro, they will dissolve the Union sgain. Well, it is not on the principle of protection, then, that they mean to dissolve the Union.

What is it? Now, there is a vail, that to the vision f some obscures the scene behind, which to me is as clear as the gas light that shines before ms; and here hes all the mystery. All admit, or decline to deny, the value and blessings of our Government; all are ready to concede that it is the only Government on earth where civil, religious and political freedom can be indulged and cojoyed. All admit it is the fairest fabric of Government over erected by human hands, and yet it is proposed to destrey it. Well, there is some secret it is proposed to destroy it. Well, there is some secret in for all this, not yet fully and openly disclosed. In it that they have nominated John C. Breckingainst Stephen A. Douglas? From the appreciation-encouraged by their last success—from the apprehension that Douglas may be elected. Why is it that they put Brecking in opposition to the mations, nominee of the party? Why, for no other reason than to make the election of Lincoln sure, and thus get up agitation and excitement at the South. It is, gentlemen, for the purpose of stirring up commotion, revoagitation and excitement at the South. It is, gentle-men, for the purpose of stirring up commotion, revo-lution, and disuntion, that they may revive the African slave-trade—the African slave-trade without the Union, rather than the Union without the African slave-trade, and they are impelled to it by the most debased of all considerations. They are im-relled and are prepared, not only to destroy the Gov-ernment, but to sell their liberty, and the hopes of ma-less for each fee the purpose of introducing light.

nd, for gold, for the purpose of introducing his grees from the coast of Africa, into their cotton fields, in order that they may make cotton to sell at 12 cents a pound, to put into their breaches pockets. They do not ask us to unite with them, but we, the border States, are to set in the capacity of breakwater betwen them and the North—we are to do the fighting while they make the cotton. [Appisuse.] We are to do the fighting; they are to make the money. According to the cersus of 1850, there were 350,000 slaveholders in the United States. I think the number has diminished, as will appear by the census of 1860, for the reason that negroes bring such high prices, peor men have not been able to keep them, and they have been sold to the rich planters of the South, and they are held now in larger quantities by the rich planters and smaller quantities by the noor. So that I think by the census of 1860 it will be found that their number has diminished—16 on ort mean the number of slaves has diminished—16 on ort mean the number of slave owners has diminished—and I think it is a fair computation to say that more than four fifths of the slaveholders in the United States are opposed to the revival of the trade, and the other handful propose to engage in a trade that has been pronounced to be piracy not only by our laws but by the waste civilized world; and yet they propose to set themselves up in defiance of the civilization of the world, and carry on this trade, and ask that we shall protect them in it. It would be no difficult matter to stow by figures taken from public documents authorized by Congress and issued from the different Departments of the Government, that more money has been lost by the failure to protect the labor and the interests of the non-slaveholders and of the poorer class of slaveholders, the last twenty years, than would pay for every negro in the United States twice over, estimating the negroes at 4,000,000, and valuing them at the price which our Constitution fixes upon them, \$300 a head, making \$1,200,000,000. Now go back to the ta iff of 1842 that did protect the labor of the entire country, staveholders and non-slaveholders, North and South, and ascertain what was the balance of trade, annually increas North and South, and ascertain what was the balance of trade, annually increasing, in favor of the United States, and then take the tariff of 1846, and ascertain what has been the annual balance of trade against the United States, and it will give considerably more than \$100,000,000 per annum for the last fourteen years. And yet who has proposed to dissolve the Union on that account! We have submitted, because we submit to the Constitution and the laws of our country, and to the legal centrol of a majority, as they will be compelled to do, now that that majority is against them. Now, gentlemen, I have not desired to make a charge against the 1-aders of the Breckinnings party on the subject of disunion; and if I had made a speech before you previous to the meeting of the Charlott swille Convention, I should have acquitted the entire party of any such purpace; and if I do not do it now, it is only because trey have forced upon, me the necessity of hold-

such purpose; and if I do not do it now, it is only because they have forced upon, me the necessity of holding them responsible for it. In that Charottesvulle Convention, a gentleman who occupies quite a prominent position, and is a most respectable unitable, and intelligent gentleman in all the relations of private life, one whom I have known a long time, and entertain the highest respect for, and therefore, on account of his position as a man of wealth and influence, his opinions are rendered the more important and the more conoxious. Mr. Willenghy Newton, who had the mode dy

position as a man of wealth and influence, his opinions are rendered the more important and the more oneoxious. Mr. Willoughby Newton, who had the mode sty to describe bixself to the Convention as "a retired philosopher" junghter, made a speech which contained, I think, as much treaschable matter for the speech to contained as any other gentleman could very well have infused into a speech of that length. He says:
"We are here to make a start for the Spoth, or we are here for nothing. If we are to be appelled by the shadow of disunder, let us go for Donglas; or if we are for the spoth of victory items 50 for Bell. A revolution has already taken place and we are now bowing under a government which no free people would even have ascended to Gestlement tail of awaiting an overt set. Have we not had overt acta! Have not afteen scales unlifted by law the Fugitive Slaws act. Was not the foot Compromise of 1850 an overteed! What acts shall we want for! He called upon them to take their stand now as particle. Let us axe no more compromises, but into to the God of Battle. Our fathers did not count the cost. They tought on a point of honer. They were three mailtons—we are olde. But he believed that the lead of civil war, if the Union were disorded, was a commen. There might be border forwar, but a dezen interput Virginians would queli them. But if war should come in a just a case, who would should from it! Our forefathers, with a third of our population, &c., not a teath of our terfathers, with a third of our population, &c., not a teath of our terfathers, with a third of our population, &c., not a teath of our terfathers, with a third of our population, be, not a teath of our terfathers, with a third of our population, &c., not a teath of our terfathers, with a third of our population, &c., not a teath of our terfathers, with a third of our population, &c., not a teath of our terfathers, with a third of our population, &c., not a teath of our terfathers, with a third of our population, &c., not a teath of our terfathers,

swore us so far, that they beat Scott so badly that he has has dly shown his face in public since; and Mr. Willoughby Newton voted for Pierce on that platform. Letters and Philosophy! Here was a gentleman preaching treason and disminon, the philosophy of President Arnold, of Aaron Burr, and before whom? A mass of ignorant men, whose passions were to be excited and led away? No! He was addressing himself to the chite, the effect, the chosen representatives of the Breckinridge Democracy of this State; and when he proposed to retire from the stand, they cheered him to go on—"Go on!" they were delighed with such philosophy as he preached, and he did go on, constructing himself; and them that his "blain destring." gratuating himself and them that his "plain doctrine" was not distateful to them. Oh! what a pity it is for the memory of Aaron Burr, that he lived lifty years too soon! He would have had no competitor in the too soon! He would have had no competitor in the Baltimore or Richmond Conventions for the nomination by this party for the Presidency. (Applause.) For I am told that when a gentleman named Bald-win, from she State of New-York, altempted to say something in the Richmond Convention favorable to the Union, he was called to order, and not allowed to proceed with his remarks. What did he design against his country beyond that of dismembering the Union and installing a Southern Confederacy? What more and what less do these Democrats comtemplate or threaten? And in what are they better than ke, and why are they patriots and he a traitor, whom every child is tasght in infancy to abhor? But that is not all. We have the opinions of other gentlemen on the

all. We have the opinions of other gentlemen on the subject.

I hardly need tell you what is Mr. Yancey's position, or read his Sisughter letter that has been published in every newspaper—no, not in all. I do not know whether it has been in every newspaper, for I do not believe that the Breckinridge papers will publish [Applenee.] But I will read to you what he says: "No national party can save us, no sectional party can eve do it. But if we could do se our fathers did-organuse Commit teas of Safety all over the Conton States (and it is only in them that we can hope for any effective movement), we shall fire the Southern heart, instruct the Southern mind, give courage to each other, and at the proper moment, by one organized to occurred action, we can precipitate the Cotton States into a revo-letton."

Jan, 11, 1860, before the Alabama Democratic Con-Jun. 11, 1850, before the Arabana Periodican may be vention, he said:

"But in the Presidential contest a Black Republican may be elected. If this dire event should happen in my opinion the only hope for the South is in a withdrawal from the Union, before he shall be imaginated."

But he skys a gain:

"Upon that question I bide my time, and shall be ready with the readiest, believing at the same time that sufficient cause exists for a resort to that expedient, even now if it were expedient."

Upon his present course, as taken during his tour rough the Northern States, The Edgefield (S. C.

Advertiser saye: "But why should Mr. Yancy endeavor to fight against the "But why should Mr. Yancy endeavor to ugus against me general conviction that he is a Disunioussi. It is the very thing that has given him strength in the present hour of strie. It is certainly, the cause why many South Carolinians have thrown up their hets for him. Take away his Disunion strength, and Mr. Yancey, it seems to us, will be another Samson, shorn of his strength."

"At all events, we venture the assertion that ninety-ine hundredths of the Disunionists for set at the South are

"At all events, we venture the assertion that ninely ine handreaths of the Dismionirs' per se' at the South are perfectly satisated with bir. I succey a extremelson; is it not tru-that they believe him to be the raining spirit of approaching dis-location I and if this estimate of this be correct, is it not much efter and much wise that he should drap a mere warfare of colley, and come out boildy for Dismion in certain contingen-

Well, now, it was not necessary to undertake to Well, now, it was not necessary to undertake to show you that Mr. Yancey is a disanionist. But we have something more of it in our own State. Your late Governor, Mr. Wise, has made a speech, recently, which I have not read, but I am told he takes the ground that the election of Lincoln would be an act of war; and on my way here this morning I saw an article taken from The Richmond Enquirer, in which

that paper says:

"Virgina out no more prevent the dissolution of this Union after Lincoln's election, than she can prevent that election. She will be powerless to prevent civil war, with all its attendant horrors. Any one of the receiver States can, and some of the mill broke the whole country. North as well as South, in the interrection strike of a bloody and decolating civil war. Frequence with the meaning that he may be considered to the paper.

but hitched as she is to the Southern States, she will be dragged into a common destiny with them, so matter what may be the desire of the people. We believe that a large majority of the people of Virginia, if the opportunity of a State Convention was allowed them, would vote for immediate resistance and for a common destiny with the Southern States, and with this belief we would advise the Slave States not to heritate to strike an early blow from fear that Virginia may hesitate in her duty to the South."

we would advise the Slave States not to be state to strike an early blow from fear that Virginia may hesitate in her duty to the South."

Now, gentlemen, I will not trust mytelf to characterize that article from the leading organ of the Breckinridge party in this State as it deserves to be. I confess I have not language to express my utter abhormence and indignation at reading such an article from the leading organ of the Breckinridge party in this State. The English vocabulary would not more than furnish me with terms to say what I think of it. One thing I have to say, however, is this, and I say it with all becoming respect for Mr. Buchanan, between whom and myself have always existed feelings of kindness and respect, and I still feel for him a warm personal regard; but of his political coarse I wish I could say less than I am obliged to say; but if he knew his duty, and had the firmness to execute it, it is my solumn conviction he would not only have the authors of that article, but every man who preaches dismining and endeavors to stir up rebellion in the Government, instantaneously arrested; and if I were President of the United States, so help me God, I would do it before the week ran out. [Great applause.] I would have them arrested for conspiracy to levy war against the United States—not for war or treason, but for high misdemeanor, for conspiracy to levy war against the United States—not for war or treason, but for high misdemeanor, for conspiracy to levy war against the United States—not for war or treason, but for high misdemeanor, for conspiracy to levy war against the United States—not for war or treason, but for high misdemeanor, for conspiracy to levy war against the United States—not for war or treason, but for high misdemeanor, for conspiracy to levy war against the United States—not for war or treason, but for high misdemeanor, for conspiracy to levy war against the United States—not for war or treason, but for high misdemeanor, for the law to the states and I would test the strength of the la

given it the power to protect itself.

In the trial of Aaron Burr, who, by the by, was ac In the trial of Aaron Burr, who, by the by, was acquitted of the charge of treason on a technicality of haw raised by my father, who was one of his counsel, on the subject of what constituted an overtact, he was acquitted of the charge of treason, because they could not prove the overt act; and then he was arraigned for misdemeanor—for conspiracy to levy war against the United States, and the country was ransolved during the Administration of Mr. Jefferson raigned for misdemeanor—for conspiracy to levy war sganst the United States, and the country was ransacked during the Administration of Mr. Jefferson (who knew his duty and had the nerve to perform it), that they might establish upon him, by his correspondence, the charge of misdemeanor, and if they could have been found he would not have been acquitted. In that trial, Chief Justice Marshall, one of the purest men and one of the profoundest expounders of law that ever adorned the Bench of this or any other country, says:

opinion which he appears to have prepared on great considera-tion; he says the quota of opinion, that if a body of people con-spire and meditate an insurrection to resist or oppose the execu-tion of a statute of the United States, they are guilty of a high misdemeaner. But if they proceed to carry that intention into execution they are guilty of the treason of levying war, and the quantum of force employed neither increases nor diminishes the

Again, Judge Marshall says:

Again, Judge Marshall says:

"Any combination to subvert by force the Government of the Urited States; violently to diamember the Union; to compel a change in the Afministration; to coerce the repeal or adoption of a general law, is a complicacy to levy war, and if conspiracy be carried into effect by the actual surpleyment of force, by the embodying and assembling of men, for the purpose of executing the transmatic design which was previously conceived, it amounts to a levying of war."

Well, now, the question is are these gentlemen engaged in any attempt to answer the Government, to change the

Well, now, the question is are these gentlemen engaged in any attempt to survert the Government, to change the Administration, to cherce an election, or to defeat an election; and if they are, are they not, under that decision, thus prenounced guilty of high mi-demeanor; and, if so, why is it that the President of the United States sits with his arms folded without any attempt to arrest if 7 Well, he happer sto belong to the same political party; he has, in fact, descended from his high estate and come down into the political arena. He either does not know, or has not the manliness to perform, his duty to the country.

measures. The members of the Legislatures will make inflammatory speeches, and the subject will finally be referred to a committee. The committee will act upon it at their leisure, and toward the close of the session, they will report that inasmuch as Virginia and the other Somhein Border States are not prepared to act upon the subject, it is premature for them to move, and they will posture the evil day until the R wise States. they will postpene the evil day until the B rder States show that there is no such right as the right sion. [Great applause.] This Constitution

I say, in the first place, the Union is not going to be dissolved, for the reason that they have no right to dis-solve the Union for any such cause. It is no more cause for a dissolution of the Union that Lincoln should cause for a dissolution of the Union that Lincoln should be elected, if a majority of the people of the United States, acting under the forms proscribed in the Con-stitution, and in accordance with the laws of the coun-try, should choose to elect him, than it would have been in the year 1800, for the Federal party to have dissolved the Union on account of the election of Mr. Jefferson. The Federalists were as hostile to the Democratic party then, as the Democratic party are to the Republican party at the present day, and if it was not cause for dissolution then, it is not cause now; and if it were good cause then, it is rood cause now. If it were good cause, we all should be revolutionists; I should have been a revolutionist all my life, for I have should have been a revolutionist all my life, for I have rarely seen the man of my choice elected President. But I yield to the Constitution and the laws of my country, and to the expressed will of the majority of the people of the United States.

When did this right of revolution, this right to secode from the Union—when did it begin? If it exists now, did it not exist from the time of the adoption of the Constitution?

But I come to that subject presently.

Is it necessary that I should introduce authority here

to show that there is no right to dissolve the Govern-ment for any such cause? I have the authority here. But, to be sure, it is of no great weight. It is only that of a number of insignificant characters, whose opinions never did exert any influence over the public mind, especially of late years, since we have been blessed with the present generation of politicians and statesmen. We have a new set of unfladged politiblessed with the present generated of unfladged politi-cians, many of them just from school, who speak flip-pantly of the institutions founded by our fathers, who give laws to the country as leaders and organs of parties, and they tell us they have the right to secede

from the Union.

And what of it, if I bring before you the opinions of And what of it, if I bring before you the opinions of such men as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Andrew Jackson and Spencer Roane to offset the opinions of these mushroom politicians? And yet Mr. Madison said they had no such power; for when New-York proposed to come into the Confederacy upon the condition that she should be permitted to offer certain amendments to the Constitution, and Mr. Hamilton wrote to Mr. Madison to know if New-York could come into the Union upon such conditions, what does Mr. Madison say: what does Mr. Madison say:

what does Mr. Madison say:

'My opinion is, that a reservation of a right to withdraw, if amendments be not decided on under the form of the Constitution within a certain time, is a conditional ratification; that it does not make New-York a member of the new Union, and, consequently, that she could not be received on that plan Compacts must be reciprocal; this principle would not in such a case be preserved. The Constitution requires an adoption in toro, and nontrien. It has been so adopted by the other States. An adoption for a limited time would be as defective as an adoption of some of the articles only. The idea of receiving a right to withdraw was started at Alchmond, and considered as a conditional ratification, which was likely abandoned as worse than a rejection."

In a letter written to Mr. Webster in 1833, Mr. Madison says:
"I return you my thanks for your late very powerful speech in
the Serate of the United States. It crushes multification, and

Speaking in the same letter of the Constitution, he

enye:
It makes the Government, like other governments, to oper

It makes the Government, like other governments, to of ate directly on the people, places at its command the neephysical means of executing its powers; and finally proclaim
super-macy, and that of the laws made in pursuance of it, of
the Constitutions and laws of the States—the powers of
Government being exercised, as in other elective and respons
governments under the control of its constituents, the peamad the Legislatures of the States, and subject to the averovernments under the control of its constituents, the people at the Legislatures of the States, and subject TO THE REVOCTORANT ALL IN of the People in catterne cases."

Mr. Madison to E. Sward Everett (Miles's Begister,

upplement to vol. 43, pp. 25, 26, 27), Angust, 1830,

"A pull ical system that does not provide for a peaceable and authoritative termination of existing controversies would not be more than the shadow of a government, the object and end of a real government being the substitution of law and order for un-certainty, contains, and visiones. In the event of a failure of every constitutional resort, and an accumulation of autrosticus and shows, rendering massive obedience and nonmanupations and abness, rendering passive obedience and non-resistance a greeter will than resistance and revolution, there can remain has one resent, the last of all—an appeal from the can-resistance of the constitutional compact to the original rights and the law of self-preservation. This is the ultima ratio of all governments, whether consolidated, confederated, or a

compound of both. It cannot be doubted that a single member of the Union in the extremity supposed, now its villa only, would have a right, as an extra and ultra constitutional right, to ake the appear."

Again, Mr. Madison says:

"The distinguished names and high authorities which appear to have asserted and given a practical scope to this docuring (nal-lifecation) entitle it to a respect which it might be difficult otherwise to feel for it."

Under the old articles of confederation, which I shall refer to more particularly hersafter, Mr. Jefferson held the more particularly hersafter.

Under the old articles of confederation, which I shall refer to more particularly hereafter, Mr. Jefferson held that it was not necessary to give the power to Congress under the Constitution to enforce anything—for example, contributions of money—for they have it by the law of insture. He says:

"It has been so often said, as to be generally believed, that Congress has no power, by the confederation, to enforce anything—for example, contributions of money. It was not necessary to give them that power expressive—they have it by the law of nature. When two parties make a compact, there results to each the power of compelling the other to execute it. Compalsion was never so easy as in our case, when a single frigule would now they our the commerce of any State the deficiency of its contribution:

There, under the old articles of confederation, Mr. Jefferson recognizes the power of the Government to resort to force by sending troops into a State and com-

resort to force by sending troops into a State and compelling centributions.

In the year 1814 you read of the Hartford Convention, and you never heard the name of any man connected with that treasonable movement, which first proposed to secede from the Union daring the war, but in terms of scorn and ignominy: Mr. Weester, who was charged with being a member of the Convention, but who, I believe, always declared he was there for the purpose of opposing their designs, yet did not live long enough to remove the stain that rested upon him under the charge that he was a member of that Convention, the design of which was Disamon or revolution, under circumstances one hundred fold more trying than these under which we are no a threatened with it. At that time there was another gentleman who exerted than these under which we are no watereared with it. At that time there was another gentleman who exerted a great indicence over the minds of the Democracy of the State, who is now no more—I mean Thomas Ritchie of The Richmond Empurer. The Enquirer of that day—then under the control of the party headed by Mr. Jefferson—and with the whole body of the ablest men of the Democracy in the Union as its contributors and advisers, and when no step was taken by that paper that was not approved by the "Junto"—said:

that paper that was not approved by the said:

"No man, no association of men, no State or set of States has a right to withdraw itself from the Union of its own accord. The same power which knift no tosether can unknit. The same formality which formed the links of the Union is necessary to dissolve it. The majority of States which formed the Union must consent to the withdrawal of any one branch of it. Until that consent has been obtained, any attempt to dissolve the Union or obstruct the efficacy of its Constitutional laws, is Tarason—Tarason to ALL INTENES AND PURPOSES."

obstruct the efficacy of its Constitutional laws, is Treason— Treason to all interior and proposes."

I need hardly refer you to the proclamation of General Jackson in 1833, which is, doubtless, familiar to you all, in which he declared he would enforce the execution of the laws in South Carolina, when she refused to submit to the revenue laws. Yes, and though he was the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and had control of and Navy of the United States, and had control of both for the purpose of enabling him to execute the laws, not being able to measure the exact amount of the resistance his troops would meet with, he called on Congress for additional forces under what has been known as the "Force Bill," and they gave him all he desired, and they did right, for the reason that if the law was wrong it should have been repealed, and if not repealed, whether right or wrong, as long as it remained on the statet-took of the United States it should have been enforced, for there is no such thing as government without law, and no such thing as law

government without law, and no such thing as law without the rower to enforce it.

After stating that a Convention held in the State of South Carolina had ordained that that State was no lenger a member of the Union unless the revenue laws

after snaring that a Convention held in the State of Section of control of the country.

It might be a difficult matter to convict such men as Mr. Yancey, and a partial jury might acquit him, but the moment he opened gazin on the analyset I would have him arrested again; and if he again opened upon the subject, siter having been again acquired. I would have him arrested again; and if he again opened upon the subject, siter having been again acquired. I would have him arrested again; and if he again opened upon the subject, siter having been again acquired. I would have him arrested again; and if he again opened upon the subject, siter having been again acquired. I would have him arrested again; and if he again opened upon the subject will find a state of this intranect to proclaim not only that the discount of Control of the state as well as in Alabama and South Corolina. Suppose n body of men were marching up and down the streets of our principal clities with drum and fife, to recruit or enlist soldiers, for the purpose of taking possession of or pubverting the Government or raining the standard of rebellion against the United States in the event of a contingency which was almost sure to happen, would there be any hesitation as to the propriety of their arrest; and if public speaking and writing in the mewapapers are deemed more efficient means for the accomplishment of the same objects, why should not the same step be taken to brown the unit. I have not stream the surface of the accomplishment of the same objects, which was accomplished to the same step of the same objects, which was accomplished to the same step of the convention of the same objects, which was accomplished to the same step of the same objects, which was accomplished to the same step of the same objects, which was accomplished to the same step of the same objects, which was accomplished to the same step of the same objects, which was accomplished to the same step of the same objects, which was accomplished to the same step of the same objects

show that there is no such right as the right of secon

hat
"This Constitution, and the laws of the United States, which
shall be made in pursuance thereof, shall be the supreme law of
the land, and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby,
anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary
more that anding."

Who adopted this Constitution of the United States? We, the people of Virginia, though our representatives in Convention are just as much parties to the Constitu-tion of the United States as to our own Constitution. But let us go back a little. Let us go back to the Ar-ticles of Conferations under which we lived before the

Constitution was adopted, and see what we did there.

My purpose is to show you that this is a perpetual
Union, which there is no power to destroy. [Applause.]
Under the old Articles of Confederation it is provided that no two States shall enter into any alliance what-

"that no two States shall enter into any alliance whatever between them without the consent of Congress, specifying accurately the purpose for which the same is to be entered into, and how long it shall continue." Again, Article 13th:

"Every State shall abide by the determination of the United States in Congress assembled on all questions which by this confederation submited to them; and the articles of this confederation submited to them; and the articles of this confederation submited to them; and the articles of this confederation that be incically observed by every State, AND THE UNION SHALL BE PERPETUAL."

And the concluding article reads:

"And we do further solemnly plight and engage the faith of our respective constituents, that they shall abide by the determination of the United States in Congress assembled on all questions which by the said confederation are submitted to them. And that the articles thereof shall be invisiblely observed by the States we respectively represent and that THE UNION SHALL BE PERPETUAL."

There was the compact between the States,—there

There was the compact between the States,—there was the marriage ceremony solemnly performed in the face of the world, by which we bound ourselves together for better or for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, in prosperity and in adversity, through good and evil report, till death do us part. [Great applanse.] And under this Constitution of the [Great applause.] And under this Constitution of the United States it is declared that "we the people of the United States, in order to form a Morre Perfect Uniton, establish justice, Insure Domestic Transquitting, &c., &c., &c., do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

"To make this a more perfect Union." And in what respect did they make it more perfect? They provided for its perpetaity by giving to the Government the power to enforce its laws and protect its own existence.

Yes, but gentlemen say, it is a reserved right! How was it reserved! When was it reserved! Where was it reserved! It is a reserved right in their own imagit reserved? It is a reserved right in their own imaginations, and there only. What a calcumny and libel
upon the name and fame of the great and good men
who made the Constitution, to say that when they declared that the Constitution of the United States, and
all laws made under it, should be the supreme law of
the land, and that the Judges of the courts in the several States should be bound thereby; when they prohibited you from the right, even in your organic law,
in the adoution of your State Constitution to say order. in the adoption of your State Constitution, to say or do anything that would, to any extent, conflict with any law made under it; that they reserved the right to permit the violation of the Constitution and all law, at any moment it suited their pleasure to do so. Why, when did that right begin ! Here I have shown you it was a perpetual contract, that it was never intended to be dissolved; and yet, after they had done their work, one State, on the very next day, had the right to withdraw and break up the whole! with or without cause; they being made judges of the cause.

Reserved rights!

And what is the argument used by Mr. Yancey, in 2 speech he made the other day in Boston? Just that which is used by all these gentlemen who talk about reserved rights—that all the powers not granted to the Federal Government are reserved to the States. Well, I never heard one of three gentlemen quote correctly that feature of the Constitution yet. Whether they only it for the Constitution yet.

that feature of the Constitution yet. Whether they omit it from ignorance or design, it is notion me to say. Unless they mean to mislesd the public mind, I can hardly account for it why it is they do not quote it rightly. The article reads:

The powers not deleasted to the United States by the Constitution, nor probability by it to the States, are reserved respectively to the States or to the people.

Now, I have just read another clause of the Constitution, which shows you what is prohibited to the States. And what is prohibited to the States? It is, that you shall do nothing by State law or constitutional